Case 1:07-cr-00907-SAS Document 72 DOCUMENT LAW OFFICES **ELECTRONICALLY FILED** BARRY LEVIN **DOC #:** SUITE 333 DATE FILED: 600 OLD COUNTRY ROAD GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK 11 (516) 222-4500 FACSIMILE (516) 228-8120 WRITER'S DIRECT LINE S BARRY LEVIN (516) 222-4502 JEANNIE L. BERGSTEN February 25, 2008 Hon. Shira A. Scheindlin United States Courthouse 500 Pearl St., Room 1620 New York, NY 10007 Re: United States v. John Melicharek, 07-Cr.-907 (S-1) Dear Judge Scheindlin, On behalf of Mr. Melicharek I write to respectfully request that the Court reconsider its denial of Mr. Melicharek's request to return to work as set forth in our letter of February 8, 2008. As stated therein, Mr. Melicharek's family is facing severe financial hardship as a result of his current circumstances. The government in their letter of February 20, 2008 states that Mr. Melicharek recently received \$100,000.00 in his bank account from "unknown sources". The government's implication is that Mr. Melicharek had received funds from an illicit source. Such is not the case. Prior to Mr. Melicharek's bail hearing of December 12, 2007, Mr. Melicharek and his wife obtained a home equity loan in the sum of \$200,000.00. The purpose of this loan was to allow Mr. Melicharek to consolidate their outstanding financial obligations and to obtain funds to procure counsel. The government's allegations that those funds were from an unknown source is a misunderstanding of the documents which were provided to the government in advance of Mr. Melicharek's release on bail. In fact, when the defendant appeared before the United States Attorney's Office to document the source of the funds and property offered for Mr. Melicharek's bail, Sandra Melicharek specifically informed the AUSA of the Upon further consideration ont ofting considerations.

With the fourthern District fre-Trial Services Office of free freely amend the conditioning the Upolical art of the freely amend the conditioning the freely after the first of the firs

At that time the government accepted the Melicharek's representations. The government's present allegation that the funds came from an unknown source is disingenuous. Mr. Melicharek has not received any funds from any source whatsoever since his incarceration.

Moreover, I've had an opportunity to speak with the defendant's Pretrial Services Officer Kenneth Rowan who has informed me that Pretrial Services has supervision strategies in place that would allow Mr. Melicharek to return to work at the job site located at the entrance ramp to the Holland Tunnel, New Jersey Turnpike, Jersey City, New Jersey for the approximate six-month period the work is scheduled to continue. Mr. Melicharek seeks to work 7:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m. each day, Monday through Friday, and would be confined to that particular job site. Officer Rowan further advised that he would have no objection to supervising Mr. Melicharek on a daily basis should the defendant be allowed to return to work.

Lastly, as set forth herein, Mr. Melicharek and his family are facing financial hardship. Allowing Mr. Melicharek to return to work will allow his family to maintain their home and support their two minor children.

For all the reasons set forth hereinabove, it is most respectfully requested that Your Honor reconsider its decision of February 21, 2008 denying Mr. Melicharek's request to return to work.

Most respectfully submitted,

BL/jlb Enc.

AUSA Elie Honig cc:

Pretrial Services Officer Ken Rowan X

All defense counsel